DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 400 228 SP 036 868

AUTHOR Myers, Charles B.
TITLE University-School Collaborations: A Need to Reconceptualize Schools as Professional Learning Communities Instead of Partnerships.
PUB DATE 11 Apr 96
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, April 8-12, 1996).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; College School Cooperation; Constructivism (Learning); *Educational Change; *Educational Principles; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Knowledge Base for Teaching; *Partnerships in Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Professional Development Schools; School Restructuring; School Role; Teacher Educators
IDENTIFIERS Experienced Teachers; *Learning Communities; Professionalization of Teaching; *Teacher Development

ABSTRACT

An analysis of school-university collaborative efforts to establish partnerships and professional development schools (PDSs) suggests that most of these efforts focus on the induction of student teachers, interns, and beginning teachers. Little attention is devoted to helping university-based teacher educators or experienced school faculty study their own practice, improve their work, or reform what they do. Nor is there much attention to rethinking or recreating schools as organizations, reconceptualizing student learning, or adding to the knowledge base for teaching. To a large extent, the partnerships that were studied perpetuated several ideas about schools, learning, teaching, and professional development that have been challenged by many education scholars and reformers. Among these limiting conceptualizations are the view of teaching as a non-theoretically based craft and of schools as factories. Although current reform, restructuring, and partnership endeavors will not, for the most part, create the kinds of schools, learning, teaching, and teacher knowledge and competence that are needed, these efforts can identify: (1) points of intrusion into practice; (2) places of departure from current practice to more meaningful visions of what schools, learning, and teaching should be; and (3) vehicles for reaching these visions. PDSs and compatable broad-scale reform efforts are appropriate starting places for creating learning community schools. (Contains 27 references.) (IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 400 228

University-School Collaborations: A Need to Reconceptualize Schools as Professional Learning Communities Instead of Partnerships

by
Charles B. Myers
Professor
Peabody College, Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Myers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting
of
American Educational Research Association

April 11, 1996

New York, New York

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SB 686 868

University-School Collaborations: A Need to Reconceptualize Schools as Professional Learning Communities Instead of Partnerships

Introduction

This paper is an outgrowth of the author's analysis over the last five years of a number of university-school collaborative efforts in the United States and Canada to establish partnerships or professional development schools, as well as of a parallel inquiry into several action research endeavors of university faculty in the United Kingdom. To a great extent, that analysis has been based on reports and descriptive writings about the collaborative efforts rather than on direct contact with individual PDS operations. The analysis has been intended to accomplish the following purposes:

1). to identify the conceptual bases upon which university-school professional development partnerships rest, including their undergirding images of

(a) the nature of schools as places, institutions, and organizations
(b) the nature of learning
(c) the nature of teaching
(d) the nature of the knowledge base for teaching, teacher learning, and teacher professional development;

2). to compare these conceptualizations with ideas described in recent research and scholarly literature and related appeals for education reform;

3). to determine the extent to which those who conduct university-school partnerships and PDS endeavors follow their own conceptualizations in practice;

4) to assess the extent to which the conceptualizations enhance or inhibit the partnership efforts;

5) to propose additional (possibly new) conceptualizations about schools, learning, teaching, professional knowledge, and teacher professional development that will improve partnership efforts.

General Conclusions from the Study

The analysis shows that the partnership efforts that were studied (and probably partnership and PDS efforts in general) devote significantly less attention to ideas about the nature of schools, learning, teaching, the knowledge base for teaching, and teacher learning and professional development than the attention they devote to establishing university-school arrangements, to the mechanics of the operation, and to the interpersonal relationships involved in bringing university teacher educators and pre-K-12 teachers together. The main focus of nearly all efforts is inducting new teachers into schools. Little attention is devoted to helping university teacher educators or experienced pre-K-12 school faculty study their own practice, improve their work, or reform what they do. In essence, beginning teachers, interns, and student teachers are seen as those to be taught and university faculty and experienced classroom teachers are seen as those who already know. The general goal is to prepare beginning teachers better than "the old way" but to prepare

them for teaching in a context of old ideas about schools, learning, teaching, and teacher professional development.

Much of this thinking and activity of partnerships and PDS is not congruent with the research literature or reform-oriented scholarly writing on schools as organizations, on school leadership, on the nature of learning, on the professional nature of teaching practice, on the knowledge base for teaching, and on adult learning, reflective practice, and teacher development. Because partnerships and PDS efforts concentrate their efforts on helping teacher inductees get started, they (1) see these new teachers as the only primary learners among the professionals involved (they see university faculty and experienced teachers as teachers of the inductees, not as learners), and (2) devote most of their efforts to building organizational structures, mechanics of operation, and interpersonal relationships that concentrate on the induction process.

The partnerships devote little attention (1) to helping university faculty and experienced pre-K–12 teachers analyze their own work and behavior; (2) to rethinking or recreating schools as organizations; (3) to reconceptualizing the learning of school students; (4) to advancing teaching as a professional practice; (5) to adding to the knowledge base for teaching; or (6) to applying ideas about adult learning, reflective practice, and teacher development to the continued education of experienced teachers. They tend to accept their participating schools as they are at the start of the collaboration except for the new induction process; they see teaching as a craft taught to novices by those with more practical experience; they understand the knowledge base for teaching as craft knowledge rather than constructed from theory; and they overlook the learning needs of university teacher educators and experienced teachers except when university faculty teach pre-K–12 teachers a new curriculum package or a new approach to teaching. To a great extent, they perpetuate the following ideas which educational scholars and reformers challenge: schools are technical-rational, top-down, factory-like institutions; teaching is a non-theoretically-based craft; a dichotomy exists between educational research and practice; a dichotomy also exists between pre-service and in-service teaching; experienced teachers have little need for continued learning and change; and university professors generate new knowledge about teaching, while pre-K–12 teachers do not (they *only* teach).

Therefore, I suggest that university-school partnerships be radically rethought so that they seriously incorporate into their goals and operations more recent conceptualizations of the nature of schools, of learning, of teaching, of the knowledge base for teaching, and of teacher professional development. I believe this can be accomplished if university-school partnership are made into full-scale professional learning communities for all their participants according to the newest and best ideas about schools, learning, teaching, and professional development. I also suggest that if this is not done, many university-school partnerships will continue to be nothing more than new arrangements to induct beginning teachers into ineffective, static, factory-like schools, and into a professional environment that views teaching as a craft rather than as a profession.

Why This Is the Case and What We Should Do about It

During the last few months of this study, I have begun to formulate two conclusions that are reflected in the thrust of the remaining sections of this paper: (1) Many of the problems that show up in university-school collaborative arrangements also show up prominently in school reform and restructuring efforts in general, and (2) it is often difficult to distinguish the activities of partnership and PDS endeavors from other reform and restructuring efforts that occur in the same school settings. Therefore, the remaining sections of this paper refer to school-based education reform efforts, school restructuring efforts, and university-school partnership efforts interchangeably.

As I interpret the situation, most education reformers, school restructurers, and university-school partners do not dream creatively enough. They rely too heavily on ideas of the past to envision a future worthy of pursuing. They do not create adequate images of what schools, learning, teaching, and teacher education would be like if their endeavors succeed. As

they pursue their limited efforts, they confuse their visions and goals with the means they use to attain them, and they quickly substitute new procedures and small changes in current practice for original dreams.

The very terms *reform*, *restructure*, and *partnership* assume starting with what *is* and changing it, not starting with images of something truly different and building toward them. All three terms as used by educators also seem to imply a change process that is linear, incremental, predictable, controllable, and not particularly uncomfortable. This thinking leads to the educational equivalent of *Jurassic Park*. When more things change than are predicted, those affected panic, hunker-down, and backup.

For schools, learning, teaching, and teacher education to be what they need to be, the changes that are necessary must include and be guided by truly different *visions of what should be* rather than more easily understood, shorter term, and more manageable goals of making what is now in place better. What is required is *rethinking* rather than reform, restructuring, or partnering. The thinking must break from the past and present, and the visions and goals must be thought of separately from the processes and mechanics of attaining them. The visions must serve as destinations that guide the change effort, while the processes and mechanics provide the path. Milestones along the path might mark intermediate accomplishments but they cannot substitute for ultimate goals.

This is not to say that change in schools, student learning, teaching, and teacher education can ignore where things are today, that radically new ways of doing things can be developed without proceeding in increments, or that theoretical images of seemingly perfect schools, learning, teaching, and teacher education can become reality without much trial and error and many implementation-level adjustments along the way. It does say that there must be new and different visions of what is desired and that those conceptualizations must stand independently in the minds of those seeking them from the processes, mechanics, and difficulties of how to achieve them. Questions such as the following must serve as beacons for travel into the distance: What are the central purposes of schools and how can these purposes be better served? What constitutes student learning and how can it be improved? What is the essence of teaching and what does quality teaching look like in practice? How can teacher education be of better help to schools, teachers, and students?

Four Visions of What Should Be

I suggest four visions of *what should be* as appropriate guides for reformers, retructurers, and university-school partners if they are going to rethink and recreate schools, learning, teaching, and teacher education as much and as thoroughly as is needed. Each vision is described briefly on the next few pages.

Schools as Morally Based Communities of Learners

When schools are thought of as they should be, they ought to be conceptualized as cultural communities rather than physical places, buildings, organizations, institutions, or clusters of employees who work together. As cultural communities, they must have a mission and shared core values. All community members--students, teachers, school staff, and parents--must possess a sincere commitment to achieving the mission and believe in the core values sincerely and deeply. They must belong to the community and be wanted by all of its members. All members must possess a sense of loyalty, camaraderie, and collegiality that draws everyone into a common bond. Individual attachments to the community must be so strong that they supersede individual personal desires so that everyone helps each other toward their common goals. In essence, a shared mission and a common belief in core community values must permeate every aspect of school life and must guide and drive every school decision and activity.

Student learning must be recognized and celebrated as the central mission of all pre-K-12 schools and every other school purpose and every school activity must serve common visions of all students learning at the highest possible level. This is, of course, the commonly recognized mission of schools, but reformers, restructurers, and partnership participants need to remind themselves of that fact more forcefully and continuously and to use it as their ultimate guide for creating better schools.

Learning as Experience-Based Intellectual Construction

When learning is thought of as it should be, it ought to be conceptualized in the form of a three-part intellectual process by which learners (1) gain ideas from new learning experiences, (2) match these ideas with what they have already learned, and (3) construct their own personal meaning, develop their own competence, and formulate their own values. The process should be though of as occurring because of the experiences that teachers provide for learners, rather than because of ideas that the teachers give to them. It ought to be conceived of in terms of what learners do much like the idea expressed in the following quote from John Holt about playing the cello:

> Most people would say that what I am doing is "learning to play" the cello. But these words carry into our minds the strange idea that there exists two very different processes: (1) learning to play the cello; and (2) playing the cello. They imply that I will do the first until I have completed it, at which point I will stop the first process and begin the second. In short, I will go on "learning to play" until I have "learned to play" and then I will begin to play. Of course, this is nonsense. There are not two processes, but one. We learn to do something by doing it. There is no other way.
> (Reproduced in Canfield and Hansen, 1993, p.132.)

With this image of learning, students come to be thought of as community members who experience learning much like when they participate in summer camp, in a concert orchestra, on an athletic team, or at an audience-involving play production. They are not thought of as products that come from factories in which teacher-workers produce learned students. Students learn from their participation in school experiences rather than from absorbing sets of ideas, skills, or value perspectives that their teachers give to them.

For this kind of learning to happen, teachers need to create learning experiences for students rather than produce anything, and they need to see to it that all students participate. In fact, the learning experiences that they create need to be available to and engaged in by all community members -- themselves, school staff members, parents, as well as students.

Teachers also need to think of teaching as a profession that includes their own personal, experience-based, continuous learning as one of its integral parts. They need to struggle against thinking of professional learning as something they do *in order to become* a teacher or as a parallel activity that accompanies teaching. They must see learning and teaching as a single common experience. Administrators must also realize that they learn from their own everyday work and use that learning to improve how they help teachers pursue the community's mission.

Teaching as Professional Problem-Solving

When teaching is thought of as it should be, it ought to be conceptualized as a career-long process of professional problem-solving, a process that starts when future teachers are still classroom students and does not stop before retirement, if it stops then. The process combines learning to teach and doing teaching into one common professional endeavor and is as continuous as John Holt's learning to play the cello.

As problem-solving, teaching consists of two successive teacher tasks: (1) figuring out ways in which to educate the students for whom the teacher is responsible, and (2) trying in the classroom what he or she thinks will work. When the problem-solving is successful, students learn. When it is not, teachers reassess and try to solve the problem again.

In line with the constructivist idea of learning mentioned above, when teaching is thought of as professional problem-solving, it becomes a professional intellectual investigation that includes constant personal construction of new professional knowledge, constant personal development of refined professional skills, and constant personal sorting out of professional value perspectives. Teachers come to understand, more clearly than most now do, that they do not learn to teach by simply receiving information from others or by replicating the teaching that they experienced. They *construct* their own professional knowledge, skills, and value perspectives by drawing on all of their life experiences and formulating from them their own unique professional ways of understanding and doing things. They go beyond teaching the ways their teachers taught them or the ways their college professors told them to teach. They also look at their own practice; study, analyze, reflect upon what they do in their own classrooms; and build the ideas they develop from this self-study into their own professional theories. Then, they use these personally constructed theories for future practice, always revising and always building toward better teaching and better student learning. Because teaching is problem-solving, teachers draw from research-based theory, from what they read and hear, from the examples of others, and from their own trial and error efforts. In the process, they select ideas and examples from others good practice for their classrooms, not as if the work of others serves as exemplars to be adopted uncritically, but as information from which to form their own personal professional judgments, to construct their own professional practice.

In my view, teaching is too complex and too tied to the unique circumstances and individuals in a particular classroom to be thought of as a craft that can be learned primarily on a college campus or in summer or after-school workshops and then applied through a relatively short period of guided practice, called student teaching, internship, or implementation. It is not something learned at the start of a professional career and then repeated for twenty-five to thirty years. It is also not something done according to prescriptions handed down by school administrators, supervisors, curriculum committees, textbook authors, or outsiders who develop packaged programs.

Teaching as professional problem-solving is, instead, a multi-faceted endeavor in which intelligent, highly skilled, and self-analytical professionals continuously combine the doing of teaching, learning to teach, and studying teaching; and they do so throughout their entire professional careers. The endeavor does not involve separations between theory and practice, between research and implementation, or between pre-service and in-service teacher learning. It does not divide teachers into the currently popular novice-expert categories, although it does acknowledge a developmental continuum through teachers' professional careers. It also does not accept as appropriate the idea that bureaucratically designated instructional leaders with hierarchical authority have the necessary knowledge and expertise to prescribe how teachers teach.

When teaching is conceived of as professional problem-solving, teachers are seen as the primary experts in schools and their work is considered to be the most prized thing schools do. The primary roles of all other participants in the school community -- administrators, other staff members, and parents -- are support for teachers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

When teaching is conceived of in these ways, teachers think of their professional learning, as being intertwined with every other aspect of their lives. They learn from all life experiences, including from every lesson they teach and from every interaction with colleagues, students, and classes; and they use that learning in their future work. The process continues for as long as they teach and is both guided and driven by their constantly asked question, How can I teach better? Similarly, the work of every other professional in the school community, including all those in administrative and supervisory positions, is guided by a parallel question. How can I help?

Professional Knowledge as the Knowledge of Practice

When the professional knowledge, competence, and value perspectives that teachers need to possess are thought of as they should be, that knowledge, that competence, and those values ought to be conceptualized as knowledge personally constructed by teachers, competence personally developed by teachers, and value perspectives personally formulated by teachers in the context of their professional work. The conceptualization should include at least four intermingled elements, the first of which I have already mentioned. They are as follows:

One, professional knowledge, skills, and values of teachers are constructed by teachers themselves rather than absorbed from elsewhere. Admittedly, teachers gather information from college professors, textbooks, their own experiences as students, cooperating teachers, consultants, research studies, the practices of colleagues, and so forth; but all of these are only sources of ideas, skills, and values that teachers turn to in order to construct and develop their own unique ways of knowing, doing things, and believing. They build this knowledge, develop this competence, and formulate these values based on their own background and experience.

Two, teachers construct and develop their knowledge, skills, and values in the context of how they *use* that new knowledge, and those new skills and values. They ask themselves, for example, how the information they are told in a lecture or the skill they see another teacher demonstrate will fit with their own ways of doing things and work with their own students and in their own classrooms. How they answer these types of questions, not only affects how and if they use the knowledge, but it also affects the very nature of that knowledge. And the same point also applies to skills and values. This happens because teachers determine the validity of ideas and the appropriateness of skills and value perspectives differently from the ways in which the validity and appropriateness are assessed by college teacher educators, administrators, and policy specialists. For teachers, the validation comes in terms of how well their own students learn. Because of the need for this type of validation, the value of any set of professional knowledge, skills, and value perspectives, as far as teachers are concerned, is determined by its utility in helping individual teachers teach rather than by its esoteric origin. The reputation of the developer of a recommended teaching procedure and the sophistication of the research project in which it was developed are less important than the teacher's belief, after trial in his or her classroom, that it helps students learn.

Three, the places that teachers turn to as sources of knowledge, skills, and values are not all external to themselves and their classrooms. Teachers also generate their own educational theories from their personal teaching, reflection on that teaching, and self-analysis. Each day they teach, they learn from what they try, how it works, how students respond, the social context in which it takes place, how they assess all of this, and so forth. This learning from practice simply happens as a normal part of teaching. When it works well, teachers formulate their in-class learning into personal, practical theories that they use in subsequent teaching, they communicate these theories to other teachers, and, in turn, they use in their classrooms similar theories developed by their colleagues.

Four, because teachers are adults and continuously developing professionals, all the principles of both adult learning and evolutionary professional development apply to their learning and, in turn, to their evolving knowledge, skills, and value perspectives. At any given time in their individual careers, teachers possess ideas, competencies, and value perspectives that are different

for those they possessed a short time earlier or will possess a short time in the future. They, like all humans, never stop thinking, learning, and changing. At times they even back-slide. They forget, lose proficiency, and narrow their perspective.

When teaching is thought of as professional practice, the knowledge, skills, and values that teachers possess and use in their professional work to create learning are not limited to pre-service professional education; to craft knowledge passed on by other master craft-persons; to that which is absorbed from books, lectures, workshops, and research reports; and to individual teacher trial and error guided by common sense. The knowledge, skills, and values are developed from all of the above and other sources as well. In that way of seeing things, teaching, studying teaching, and educating teachers are three facets of the same enterprise, not three separate endeavors to be conducted independently by teachers, researchers, and teacher educators.

A Context of Interconnectedness

Ideas about the nature of schools, learning, teaching, and teacher professional knowledge and competence such as these are not new, and they are readily available for reformers, restructurers, and university-school partners to use as guides for their work. They are scattered across contemporary scholarly literature in many specific areas of study, including education reform, school restructuring, organizational cultures, institutional leadership, the nature of knowledge, the nature of learning, teaching effectiveness, adult learning, reflective practice, and so forth. But, the ideas in each of these areas of study, as well as those in many other domains, seem to be pursued by reformers in relative isolation from each other, and, when reformers are attracted to specific ideas, they seem to apply them to educational practice as single innovations or one-shot solutions for particular problems.

These isolated approaches to reform ignore both the interconnectedness of learning, teaching, school contexts, and teacher development and the multi-facted, complex, and continuous nature of educational change. For example, most reform proposals concerning teaching effectiveness and accountability overlook research information about organizational communities and impose in top-down fashion procedures and accountability standards that experts who study institutional leadership reject as unworkable. Similarly, school restructuring and university-school partnership proposals tend to ignore the latest thinking about the construction of knowledge, professional development, and adult learning.

A lack of connection also exists between researchers who develop ideas for improving schools, learning, and teaching and those in schools who are expected to put the ideas into practice. For example, many of those who study teaching and make the recommendations for change that they expect others to implement concentrate their energies on formulating theories from controlled research studies and paper-and-pencil scholarship, without attending carefully enough to the contexts of practice and to the ways in which the ideas can be applied in these contexts. Although there are very noticeable exceptions, these research-based theory generators tend to see research and practice as a one-way, theory-to-practice flow and they deny responsibility once the flow reaches the classroom door. Moreover, they seem to denigrate theory that is developed from practice. A specific illustration of this phenomenon is reflected in the lack of professional connection between many researchers who study constructivist learning and teacher educators and curriculum specialists who try to teach teachers about constructivism even though their understanding of the idea is second-handed and superficial. Because of this disconnect those instructing teachers approach the implementation process mechanistically and teach the teachers in non-constructivists, didactic ways.

Although there are more good ideas about making schools, teaching, and teacher education better than all education reformers and classroom teachers can collectively introduce into common classroom practice in their lifetimes, few of these specific ideas, including the ones that actually have the potential for improving student learning and the quality of teaching in wide-spread and

noticeable ways, will become common practice unless education improvers of all types and at all levels become more successful at creating more profound changes in school and classroom practice than they have been until now. And, to do this, they need (1) to coalesce as many of the good ideas that are compatible and that they can keep track of at one time and (2) to develop a carefully selected number of them to be inserted into the real world of classroom teachers and the real lives of students. In the process of doing this, they must realize that these ideas have to be transformed as they are constructed and reconstructed in the minds and work of real teachers in actual classrooms and schools. In effect, each idea about how to improve schools, learning, teaching, and teacher education must be abstracted from one context and rebuilt in other settings. The innovations must be seen by teaching practitioners as useful new ways of doing things and these "new ways" must result in improved student learning.

Some disconnectedness is only natural. It is understandable that educational researchers and innovators have to focus on specific areas of study. They cannot investigate everything simultaneously or change everything at once. Their expertise and interests are limited. They do not know enough to study all facets of teaching, learning, and schools, and, if they did, an attempt to make general improvements in all these areas at one time for all teachers and all students would be foolhardy. Researchers, reformers, and implementors have to devote their attention to doable tasks and pursue changing some aspects of the education enterprise while other areas remain relatively stable. So, they specialize and try to fix one or a few things at a time.

Nevertheless, I believe efforts at making schools, learning, teaching, and teacher education better must be placed into a context that reflects the complex interconnectedness of the education enterprise and makes it clear to all that making the changes that are needed involves more than a number of individual, parallel, linear processes. That broader context also needs to reflect a view of present day schools, learning, teaching, and teacher education, not as static phenomena that are set at fixed points in time from which they can be moved forward rather simplistically, but as multiple parts of a mammoth enterprise floating on a sea of constant change.

Because the tasks before us involve so many ideas, so many players, so many aspects of the education enterprise, and so many specific settings, and because the figuring out of better ways of doing things must occur while schools, teaching, and teacher education continue to function (we cannot stop everything and start over), the tasks are unbelievably complicated, often un-understandable, messy, and un-nerving. This explains why the university-school-partnership-developed and administrator-imposed, top-down, technical-rational ways of changing schools, with their well stated objectives and precise pre-developed plans for others to implement, have not served us well. Reliance on something closer to chaos theory might be more useful as our general guide. We cannot all march in the same direction toward predictable ends, but, as we experiment with separate reform agendas, we must stay informed of others' work, educate ourselves along the way, and appreciate the magnitude of the general effort. When we need a rationalization to sustain us along the way, we can say: If the tasks of making schools, learning, teaching, and teaching education better were easier than they are, we would have been more successful by now.

The four visions that I have outlined -- (1) the community nature of schools, (2) the constructivist nature of learning, (3) the problem-solving nature of teaching, and (4) the personally constructed nature of teacher knowledge and competence -- are my ways of thinking about the many facets of school improvement in an interconnected and forward-looking context. I believe the visions can provide direction for individual reformers, restructurers, and university-school collaborators, as well as for reform as a general coherent movement. They can also help reformers see the importance of interacting with and informing each other and see the value of being guided by ideas that are, at a minimum, compatible.

Schools Are Not Factories and Teaching Is More Than a Craft

A major reason why reform, restructuring, and university-school partnerships have not been more successful than they have been is the fact that two metaphors have dominated nearly all thinking about schools, learning, teaching, and teacher education for nearly all of the twentieth century. These metaphors have hampered how current schools operate and how teaching is conducted and have made significant and substantial rethinking of schools, learning, teaching, and teacher education impossible. These metaphors are (1) schools are like factories and should be run by tight business-like management techniques; and (2) teaching is a craft in which work in routine, new practitioners simply follow the practice of their more experienced masters, and workers do what supervisors tell them to do.

The School-as-a-Factory Metaphor

The *school-as-a-factory* metaphor began to be used near the start of the twentieth century and is imbedded in the thinking about early industrialization in the United States. It probably never did fit schools, but if it did or not is a matter of debate that is written about elsewhere and not pertinent to our discussion here. What is pertinent, I believe, is that the metaphor does not fit schools today and that it stifles attempts to make schools better.

The school as a factory metaphor is antithetical to schools as learning communities because it accepts and reinforces two inappropriate premises about how schools function. These premises are (1) Schools can be managed and improved best through the leadership and direction of bureaucratically authorized experts who know better than the professionals in the schools, including teachers, what needs to be done to educate individual students, to conduct individual classes, and to make schools work better; and (2) the primary way of effecting improvements in individual schools is by having hierarchically-placed leaders decide what is best for individual schools and classrooms and then force or entice the other members of the school organization, including teachers, to do that which the leaders want.

The Teaching-as-a-Craft

The *teaching-as-craft* metaphor parallels the school-as-factory type of thinking. It is inappropriate for learning community schools because teaching requires much more than craft knowledge, is not routine as most craft work is, and is not learned well by mirroring the expertise of masters. Teachers must make sense out of unique teaching situations every day, decide what is best to do in these situations, and proceed according to their best professional judgments, monitoring and adjusting their actions every step of the way. Rather than artisans, teachers need to be knowledgeable, decision-making, executive managers. They manage subject matter content, class activities, student behavior, instructional resources, schedules, and much more. They are the only ones who know enough about the individual students they teach and the circumstances of their individual classrooms to decide what to do, to try it, and to monitor if it is working as well as it should be. They are the only ones who know their teaching well enough to decide how to make it better the next time.

In his writing for school principals, Sergiovanni (1992, p.69) labels the style of school leadership that typically follows the factory and teaching-as-craft metaphors as the "expect and inspect" approach and he characterizes the approach by itemizing the following sequence of administrator chores:

- State objectives.
- Decide what needs to be done to achieve these objectives.
- Translate these work requirements into role expectations.
- Communicate these expectations.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Provide the necessary training.
- Put people to work.
- Monitor the work.
- Make corrections when needed.
- Practice human relations leadership to keep morale up.

Segiovanni (1992, p.69) also suggests that this factory-style leadership is derived from two types of authority: (1) bureaucratic authority, which is based on the power of a designated leader's position in a hierarchy, set rules and regulations, formalized job specifications, and explicit assignments; and (2) psychological authority, which comes from a leader's use and manipulation of rewards and incentives on workers, including teachers. He believes that good school leaders should avoid the old-style management, rules-and-directives approaches with teachers in favor of the more subtle, psychological, and group-dynamics-based styles of enticement.

I believe, however, that both approaches are inappropriate for schools. No matter how subtle or kind leaders' styles are, if the leader believes that he or she knows best what to do and thinks his or her role is to persuade teachers (who are assumed to be less knowledgeable) to do it, the factory and teaching-as-craft concepts are still guiding school operations and teachers are being viewed as non-expert workers, not as either professional experts or as learners capable of developing professional expertise. Both types of authority assume that teachers are subordinates in the school's institutional hierarchy. Both expect teachers to follow orders from above without enough decision-making on their part, even when those decisions concern what they believe is best for their classrooms and students.

Fortunately, the factory, top-down, bureaucratic model is not very effective in penetrating beyond the closed classroom doors of good teachers, so most knowledgeable thoughtful teachers make their own decisions and educate their students without a great deal of direct interference from school system bureaucratic rules and regulations. Unfortunately, however, teachers usually have to do this by running against the bureaucratic tide instead of with the flow. This is counter productive in at least two ways: (1) Running against the tide creates unnecessary anxiety for teachers and dissipates their energy, and (2) it fails to use effectively teacher expertise, power, influence, and commitment to the moral good they do.

It is likely that one of the reasons why the factory and craft models have not been discredited and discarded when applied to schools and teachers is the fact that many teachers base what they do as professionals on their own expertise and do what they believe is best for their students in spite of what others say they are supposed to do. They simply ignore much that comes to them from above in the chain of command. Particularly notable instances of this phenomenon have been the bases of several commercial films about exceptional teachers. Even students and the general public know that especially good teachers tend to do things their own way. Principals who know this stay out of the way of good teachers except to help them do what they do best.

Even though many schools and teachers succeed with students in spite of the schools-as-factories and teaching-as-craft thinking, the thinking hurts efforts to improve schools by denying teachers leadership roles in three specific ways. First, it places teachers at the worker level in a business-style hierarchy rather than at the level of professional experts who need to be capable of and free to make their own decisions about students, student learning, and how to teach. Second, it assumes that teachers should and need to be managed, monitored, supervised, analyzed, and evaluated by technocrats who hold places above them in an inappropriate hierarchy. (We would suggest that if a principal or a curriculum supervisor knows how to teach a specific class of students better than those students' teacher, the wrong person is teaching the class, and possibly, the principal or supervisor should return to teaching.) Third, it relies on artificially constructed, extrinsic rewards to prompt teachers to teach better, instead of the intrinsic rewards that are inherent in teaching -- a belief in the moral goodness of teaching, satisfaction in seeing

students succeed and achieve, and personal feedback from students, colleagues, and parents that show appreciation for a job well done.

This third flaw in the schools-as-factory, teaching-as-craft way of thinking about teachers actually runs counter to much recent scholarship about the place and role of motivation in organizations in general, and the point is particularly relevant for teachers and school organizations, especially when school organizations are thought of as communities and when change in schools is the focus of the scholarship. For example, W. Edwards Deming criticized the overuse of extrinsic rewards even in business settings when he observed that, "People are born with intrinsic motivation, dignity, curiosity to learn, joy of learning" (Senge, 1990b, p. 7). Peter Senge noted that motivation based on external rewards and negative reinforcers discourages both individual and organizational learning and that superior performance of individuals in organizations depends on both types of learning (1990b, p.7).

Some of the researchers who are best know for their analyses of teacher motivation and work satisfaction draw similar conclusions. In studying schools in the 1970's, Dan Lortie (1975) found that teachers are attracted to teaching because of their desire to serve others, their desire to work with students, their enjoyment of the job of teaching, the "material benefits" of teaching, and the school calendar. Similarly, Susan Moore Johnson (1990) found in her study of teachers in Massachusetts that teachers are motivated primarily by their work with students and the pleasure of doing the general work of teaching. Sergiovanni (1992, pp. 59-60) concluded from a number of other studies about worker satisfaction that motivators that push people beyond minimal levels of performance are typically concerned with the work itself rather than conditions associated with the work. He identifies specific motivators as a sense of achievement, recognition of good work, challenging and interesting work, and a sense of responsibility for one's work. He makes particular mention for teachers of the importance of experiencing meaningfulness, personal responsibility, and a knowledge of results.

These studies as a group reinforce several general points about teacher motivation. One, good teachers are already rewarded intrinsically by the work that they do. Two, extrinsic, bureaucratic rewards are at best unnecessary and at their worst demeaning and hindering of good teaching. Three, those who want to encourage good teaching should devote their energies in two directions: (1) toward enhancing teacher opportunities to experience the rewards inherent in what they do rather than toward constructing external rewards, and (2) toward removing the hampering conditions of work that make the day-to-day tasks of teaching more difficult than they need to be.

This last point is especially important. Teachers are not likely to experience the usual rewards of their work if they cannot succeed, if they believe the organization is unnecessarily burdensome, and if those whom they consider leaders are not helpful.

School leadership scholars have been quite vocal in recent years in blaming the school-as-factory model for the lack of improvement of schools and their criticism is on target. One such direct condemnation is voiced by Sergiovanni in terms of what he calls the "managerial mystique." He says, in part:

> In practice, the managerial mystique represents a tacit compact among too many policy makers, administrators, and academics, which places process before substance and form before function. So strongly does the mystique adhere to belief in the right methods that the methods themselves become surrogates for results. It also holds so firmly to the belief in management controls, as the way to overcome human shortcomings and enhance productivity, that the controls become ends in themselves.
>
> The result is an emphasis on doing things right, at the expense of doing the right things. In schools, improvement plans become substitutes for improvement outcomes.

> Scores on teacher appraisal systems become substitutes for good teaching. Accumulation of credits in courses and in service workshops becomes a substitute for changes in practice. Discipline plans become substitute for student control. Leadership styles become substitutes for purpose and substance. Congeniality becomes a substitute for collegiality. Cooperation becomes a substitute for commitment. Compliance becomes a substitute for results. Where the managerial mystique rules, school administrators are forced to do rather than decide, to implement rather than lead. (Sergiovanni, 1992, p.4)

Reform, Restructuring, and Partnership Endeavors as Starting Points

Although my primary assertion in this paper is that current reform, restructuring, and partnership endeavors will not create the kinds of schools, learning, teaching, and teacher knowledge and competence that are needed, I do not propose that these current efforts be disbanded. However, I do suggest that they be thought of as only first steps toward more thorough conceptual shifts in our thinking about the nature of schools, learning, teaching, and teacher learning and development. As first steps, they can lead to the types of visions that I suggested earlier.

They are good places to start. Those who want to make schools, learning, teaching, and teacher education better, including those who accept my suggested visions as guides and destinations, have to begin somewhere. They cannot stop the way in which schools, learning, teaching, and teacher education currently occur and start all over again. Their efforts must find appropriate situations and circumstances in the educational enterprise that can become (1) *points of intrusion* into current practice; (2) *places of departure* from current practice toward the visions they have for schools, learning, and teaching; (3) *vehicles* for getting there.

These *points of intrusion* consist of times, events, and activities in schools and teaching that can be used to initiate experimentation, prompt new thinking, and test the efficacy of new ideas and new ways of doing things to see if they produce better student learning. They might occur when teachers are dissatisfied or bored with the way things are, when new curriculum materials are being adopted, when new technology is being purchased, when a new principal is being selected, when new teachers are hired, and when a cluster of teachers is willing to experiment in anyway.

Although potential points of intrusion are plentiful, those that are to be used to prompt substantial and long-term change must be carefully selected from among current school situations and events so that they can also serve as appropriate *places of departure*, that is, so they can provide conditions or circumstances that will stimulate rethinking and that will bring about a fashioning of different images of schools, learning, teaching, and teacher education. As places of departure, they need to produce more than one new way of doing things. They need to launch a long sequence of changes and improvements, and they need to provide contexts that sustain continual and substantial rethinking.

Each activity that is undertaken in the name of school improvement must also serve as a *vehicle for change*, that is, it must provide the means by which each change produces more change in domino and ever-broading ways. These vehicles must be able to carry into the school community environment both a norm for and a commitment to continuing change and improvement.

These points of intrusion, places of departure, and vehicles for change can be quite varied. They are, in fact, present all of the time in the normal operations of schools and in the day-to-day work of teachers. The trick to using them effectively is recognizing them and making the most of the opportunity. They might be small in scale, affecting only a few teachers, or school-wide or

larger, but the changes that grow from them must involve the whole school community; must trigger rethinking, not just one-shot changes; and must establish continuous renewal as a sustainable norm.

Although it is a mistake to suggest particular types of points of intrusion as if an identifiable few types fit all circumstances, I believe many current reform and restructuring efforts that include university-school partnerships can provide these appropriate starting points. In saying this, however, I acknowledge that many present partnership endeavors, including many that are called professional development schools, would not be appropriate. Many of them are superficial, artificial, and ineffective. Some are nothing more than new labels for old-style student teaching. Others were started with good intentions but lack vision and have failed to make any meaningful progress.

Nevertheless, I believe PDSs provide potentially appropriate points of intrusion, places of departure, and vehicles for change for several reasons. First, most partnerships and PDSs have been established for the purposes of making large-scale and long-term changes in practice and for rethinking schools, teaching, teacher education, and the process of change in general.

Second, partnerships and PDSs attempt to draw together the various types of professional educators who need to work in concert more often and more effectively if schools, learning, teaching, and teacher education are to be rethought and made better. Typically, good, broad-scale PDSs include teachers, school administrators, policy specialists, teacher educators, educational researchers, and theoretical scholars, and they focus on places in the education enterprise at which these role players' expertise and interests intersect. In contrast, most other types of reform efforts have more narrowly identified focuses and constituents, and their key actors seem to have less time and motivation to engage in serious self-analysis and to seek ideas and advice from those undertaking parallel efforts at change outside their immediate purview.

Third, most partnerships and PDSs attempt a wide range of changes, each of which has multiple impacts on the education enterprise in general, and, therefore, creates the opportunity and need for additional changes. If these domino and widening effects are encouraged and directed appropriately, change can build upon change, and, eventually, change can become a consistent and accepted cultural norm. If this happens, the PDS activities serve not only as points of intrusion into *what is,* but also serve both as places, of departure toward *what can be* and as vehicles for getting there.

Fourth, the multiple activities of establishing, operationalizing, and conducting partnerships and PDSs serve as optimal vehicles for change because they require so many concomitant changes in how schools, learning, teaching, and teacher education are conducted. Even those who become involved only peripherally often have to replace some of what they had been doing with new ways and have to think differently about what they do. In effect the new ways force change in the thinking of even those who did not choose to get involved, got involved without understanding what their involvement meant, or got involved only reluctantly and for the wrong reasons. As they evolve, PDSs force participants to make unanticipated changes that they would not have chosen to make if they had been asked to do so at the start.

I do not mean to suggest that current partnership and PDS endeavors, or broader reform and restructuring efforts as a whole, pursue the four visions that I believe should be guides for creating learning community schools. I know of none that do and that is why I believe that my suggested visions transcend current thinking. However, I do think that PDSs and comparable broad-scale reform efforts are appropriate places to start.

Even the fact that most of these efforts are not by themselves adequate vehicles for change can be useful as they serve as points of departure in a negative way. Their approaches to change and many of their specific ways of trying to produce change can be beginning points that are both adequate at first and noticeably inadequate as they evolve to the point at which sustained change and re-conceptualizing schools, learning, and teaching are necessary. Because they start change and experimentation but soon falter, they become imperfect examples that can be improved upon as

the change process progresses. For instance, many current PDSs attempt inappropriately to make things better (1) by imposing changes by force from outside, (2) by placing too many and contradictory demands on teachers, (3) by focusing on what is (usually the weakest aspect to what is) rather than on what could be, and (4) by pursuing single-step efforts away from what is toward narrow conceptions of something better. All of these attempts will start a change process but they will not lead to significantly improved teaching or student learning.

However, when those involved in these efforts realize the inadequacy of what is happening, they can make adjustments that can be successful. They will understand that, although there is little evidence that their goals of improved teaching and learning are being attained, there is clear evidence that the first stages of reform are underway. They will see some progress and will know that it is time to revise their expectations and pursue appropriate next steps. If they are sincere about their goals, they will push on for what they now understand to be a long haul.

Similar negative examples come from reform and restructuring efforts whether they are part of PDSs endeavors or not. For instance, in many school restructuring efforts, administrators push interdisciplinary teaching and block scheduling without attending to the requisite teacher development needs for those plans to work and without any attention to how and if the efforts will improve teaching or student learning. Policy makers often impose stringent academic accountability in basic subjects upon teachers at the same time that they add expectations for teaching additional subject matter such as sex education, AIDS education, counter-violence education and thrust upon them additional classroom responsibilities such as those of the full inclusion of severely disabled students. Only rarely do they provide the necessary instruction or resources for the teachers upon whom these responsibilities are placed. Similarly, in teacher education, reformers replace semester-long student teaching with year-long internships but change little else. Others assign campus-based higher education faculty to weekly visits to pre-K-12 schools with little attention to what the visits should accomplish in terms of better student learning or teaching.

Seemingly strong partnership and PDS endeavors that quickly bog down in a confusion of means and goals also serve as imperfect examples of reform that can be improved upon. When they bog down, they send warning signals that something is wrong and they provide illustrations of circumstances that other reform efforts need to avoid or push beyond. For example, when the direct involvement of college faculty in pre-K-12 schools and the establishing of site-based management committees begin to be thought of as goals rather than means toward the bigger goals of improved teaching and learning, the error is in the thinking, not in the activities. As soon as the college faculty placement in schools and the forming of the site-based committee are re-thought of as first steps instead of as goals, the process can regenerate and move on.

If typical partnerships and PDSs are to serve as both places of departure and vehicles for change toward new ways of thinking about schools, learning, teaching, and teacher education, the critical point comes when those who are personally invested in the efforts realize that early evidence shows that not enough is being changed in order to improve teaching and learning. This time of realization is critical because it presents the dilemma of the proverbial fork in the road, but this time there are three choices. The reformers can back off and return to the old ways of doing things. ("We already tried it. It doesn't work.") They can substitute means for goals. ("Even if the students are not learning better, our teachers are doing whole language." "Even if our graduates do not demonstrate that they are noticeably better teachers, they are in real classrooms much longer during their internship.") Or, they can pause, rethink, and make more substantial conceptual changes. ("If this isn't accomplishing what we had hoped, what is absent from our thinking and how can we make what we are doing better?") If they opt for the third choice, their initial efforts at reform, restructuring, and partnership formation can eventually lead to real change.

References

Anderson, C.R. (ed.). (1993). *Voices of change: A report of clinical schools project*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Calderhead, J. (ed.). (1988). *Teachers' professional learning*. London: Falmer Press.

Canfield, J. & Hansen, M.V. (eds.). (1993). *Chicken Soup for the Soul.*. Deerfield Beach, Fl: Health Communications.

Eraut, M. (1994). *Developing professional knowledge and competence*. London: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (eds.). (1992). *Teacher development and educational change*. London: Falmer Press.

Gardner, J.W. (1981). *Self-Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society*. Revised edition. New York: Norton.

Goodlad, J.I. (1994). *Educational Renewal: Better Teachers, Better Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J.I., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K.A. (eds.). (1990). *The moral dimensions of teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Grimmett, P.R. & Erickson, G.L. (eds.). (1988). *Reflection in teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gross, T. (1988). *Partners in education: How colleges can work with schools to improve teaching and learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hawley, W. (1994). *Revisioning the education of teachers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Huberman, M. (1993). *The lives of teachers*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Huling-Austin, L. (1990). Teacher induction programs and internships. In W.R. Houston (ed.). *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*, (pp. 535-548), New York: Macmillan.

Jackson, P.W., Boostrom, R.E., & Hansen, D.T. (1993). *The moral life of schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levine, M. (1990). *Professional practice schools: Building a model*. (Vol. 2). Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers.

Lortie, D.C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nadler, N.M. (1986). *Organizations as learning communities: How managers and front line supervisors learn in nonformal ways*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Washington University).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

O'Hair, M.J. & Odell, S.J. (eds.). (1995). *Educating teachers for leadership and change.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Rosenholtz, S.J. (1989). *Teacher's Workplace: The Social Organization of Schools.* New York: Longman.

Sarason, S.B. (1990). *The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's too late?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schon, D.A. (1990). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Senge, P.M. (1990a). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Doubleday.

_____. (1990b). "The Leader's New Work: Building a Learning Organization." *Sloan Management Review*, 32 (1), 7-23.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1992). *Moral leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

_____. (1994). *Building Community in Schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

_____. (1996). *Leadership for the Schoolhouse.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sirotnik, K.A. & Goodlad, J.I. (eds.). (1990). *School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns.* New York: Teachers College Press.